

## REMARKS:

Claims 1-23 are pending of which claims 1-23 have been rejected by the Examiner.

Claims 1-4, 6, 11-14, 16, and 22-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pollock [US 6,384,564].

Claims 20-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pen [US 6111770]. Claims 5, 15, and 7-8, which depend from independent claims, have been rejected as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Independent claims 1, 11, 20, and 22 as well as dependent claims 4, 7, 9-10, 14, 21, and 23 have been amended to more accurately define the scope of the invention that the inventor believes to be novel. Because the inventor now believes that Independent claims 1, 11, 20, and 22 now recite patentably distinct subject matter, the inventor also believes that dependent claims 2-10, 12-19, 21, and 23 are also patentably distinct and non-obvious over the prior art.

With regard to Independent claim 1, the inventor has amended the claim to require a first switch placed in series with a first capacitor and both of these elements to be placed between a static common node and an inductor, as well as a second switch placed in series with a second capacitor and that this pair of elements be placed between the static common node and the inductor. It is important to note that the common node of the

instant invention is also the system ground. While the common node disclosed by Pollock is allowed to float, the common node of the instant invention is not. This combination of elements makes the instant invention novel over the prior art.

With regard to dependent claim 4, a capacitor drain circuit is connected to a node between the first capacitor and the first switch as well as between the second capacitor and the second switch. This is an important distinction over the cited prior art, especially as the draining of charge in the Pollock invention occurs at the common node, rather on the ends of the capacitors disposed away from the common node. This distinction further clarifies that the common node of the Pollock device is allowed to assume a plurality of different potentials, i.e., float, while the draining of charge in the instant application is relative to the static common node.

Independent claims 11, 20, and 22 have also been amended to include a requirement that the common node remain statically charged relative to the rest of the circuit, a departure from that disclosed by Pollock, as discussed above. The same restriction has also been added to dependent claim 14, 21, and 23.

Some of the differences between the applicant's invention and that cited by the examiner is that the coils of the instant

invention are in series and connected to switches (in one or more embodiment), the coils are not connected to the common node (in one or more embodiment), the placement of charge on the capacitors relative to the common node is **times** or **controlled** (whereas the charging circuit of the cited prior art is simply a pair of power rails), the draining circuit is connected to the caps at an end disposed away from the common node (while the cited art actually drains the common node), and the common node of the claimed invention is **static**, i.e., not allowed to float relative to the rest of the circuit.

Based on the foregoing discussion and the indicated amendments, the applicant now believes that independent claims 1, 11, 20, and 22 are now in condition for allowance, as well as dependent claims 2-10, 12-19, 21, and 23.

The applicant and his attorney thank the Examiner for his thorough review of the application and the prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

Les A. Boegemann

Reg. No. 50,121

(520) 586-0178 phone

(520) 586-0179 fax